arXiv:1407.7634v1 [math.AP] 29 Jul 2014

On metric viscosity solutions for Hamilton-Jacobi equations of evolution type

Atsushi Nakayasu[a]

[a] *Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo*
3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8914 Japan, ankys@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper studies Hamilton-Jacobi equations of evolution type defined in a general metric space. We give a notion of a solution through optimal principles and establish a unique existence theorem of the solution for initial value problems. We also note a relationship between the notion of a solution and another notion based on characterization of the modulus of the gradient in the sense of [13].

Mathematics Subject Classification: 35D40, 35F21, 35F25, 49L20, 49L25

1 Introduction

This paper studies Hamilton-Jacobi equations of evolution type defined in a general metric space $(\mathcal{X}, d)$. One of the most simple problem is the fully nonlinear equation of the form

$$u_t + |Du| = f(x) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{X} \times (0,T) \tag{1.1}$$

for a given bounded continuous function f and an unknown function $u = u(x,t)$ on $\mathcal{X} \times (0,T)$ with $T > 0$; let u_t denote the derivative with respect to the time variable t and $|Du|$ formally denote the modulus of gradient in the space variable x with $\mathbf{R}_+ = [0,\infty)$ values in the sense of [13]. That is,

$$|Du|(x,t) := \sup_{\xi \in Lip_x^1(\mathcal{X})} \{|w_s(0)| \mid w(s,t) = u(\xi(s),t)\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $Lip_x^1(\mathcal{X})$ is the set of all absolutely continuous curves $\xi : \mathbf{R} \to \mathcal{X}$ satisfying

$$|\xi'|(t) := \lim_{s \to t} \frac{d(\xi(s), \xi(t))}{|s-t|} \le 1 \quad \text{a.e. } t$$

and $\xi(0) = x$. Note that the metric derivative $|\xi'|$ is defined for an absolutely continuous curve ξ in a metric space; see [2, Chapter 1]. However, since a metric

space has no tangent space structure in general, the quantity corresponding to the derivative ξ' and the gradient Du is not well-defined.

Hamilton-Jacobi equations are fundamental in various fields of mathematics and physics and there are many works studying the equation including (2.1). We point out that the theory of viscosity solutions is successful for Hamilton-Jacobi equations defined on a Euclidean space, which is introduced by Crandall and Lions [17], [4]. This theory is extended to Banach spaces [5], [6], [7], [8]; this extension is expected to be useful for discussing an optimal control problem with respect to partial differential equations; we refer the reader to [9] and itself studies a resolvent problem of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in generalized spaces. Hamilton-Jacobi equations also appear in the optimal transport theory [19, Chapter 7, 22, 30] and the equation in Wasserstein spaces is studied by Gangbo, Nguyen and Tudorascu [10]. We also note that study on Hamilton-Jacobi equations on a space with junctions such as a network helps considering the LWR model of traffic flows [16], [18]. Such a problem on a space with junctions is studied in [15], [14].

In order to handle Hamilton-Jacobi equations in such generalized spaces, Giga, Hamamuki and Nakayasu introduced a notion of a viscosity solution of Eikonal equation in [13]. We study time evolution equations in the present paper.

We establish a unique existence theorem for an initial value problem of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Consider the value function of an optimal control problem

$$U(x,t) = \sup_{\xi \in Lip_x^1(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ \int_0^t f(\xi(r))dr + u_0(\xi(t)) \right\},$$

where u_0 is an bounded uniformly continuous function. Then, this value function U formally solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1) with an initial condition $U(x,0) = u_0(x)$. It is remarkable that the value function U satisfies

$$U(x,t) = \sup_{\xi \in Lip_x^1(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ \int_0^h f(\xi(r))dr + U(\xi(h), t-h) \right\},$$

which is called a dynamic programming principle; see, e.g. [3].

We define a notion of a subsolution and a supersolution based on the dynamic programming principle: A function u is a subsolution if $w(h) := u(\xi(h), t-h)$ satisfies

$$-w'(h) \le f(\xi(h))$$

in the viscosity sense for all curves ξ called admissible while u is a supersolution if there exists an and such that

$$-w'(h) \ge f(\xi(h))$$

in the viscosity sense for some admissible curve ξ. Then, we have the unique existence theorem easily. However, it is not clear how this definition relates to the original equation (1.1). We show that our subsolution is equivalent to a

subsolution of (1.1) in the sense of [13]. However, it seems to be difficult to show the similar statement for a supersolution.

We point out that closely related topics have studied by Ambrosio and Feng [1] and of Gangbo and Swiech [11], [12]. They study the Hamilton-Jacobi equations including (2.1) in a complete geodesic metric space. However, our theory is applicable to any spaces with metric structure.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prepare to handle generalized Hamilton-Jacobi equations in a metric space and define a class of admissible curves and a sub- and supersolution based on the dynamic programming. In Section 3 we prove some equivalent conditions for a subsolution and a supersolution. The unique existence theorem will be shown in Section 4.

2 Preliminary and definition of solutions

Consider the Hamilton-Jacobi equation of the form

$$u_t + H(x, |Du|) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{X} \times (0, T) \tag{2.1}$$

with a function $H = H(x, p) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathbf{R}$ satisfying:

(A1) $H = H(x, p)$ is a continuous function in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+$.

(A2) H is convex and nondecreasing with respect to the variable p for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Define the function

$$L(x, v) = \sup_{p \in \mathbf{R}_+} (pv - H(x, p)) \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{\infty\} \quad \text{for } (x, v) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+.$$

We then see that

Proposition 2.1. *Assume (A1) and (A2). Then, the function $L = L(x, v)$ is lower semicontinuous in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+$ and it is also convex and nondecreasing with respect to the variable v for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. In addition, the equations*

$$H(x, p) = \sup_{v \in \mathbf{R}_+} (pv - L(x, v)) \quad \textit{for all } (x, p) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+, \tag{2.2}$$

$$H(x, |p|) = \sup_{v \in \mathbf{R}} (pv - L(x, |v|)) \quad \textit{for all } (x, p) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R} \tag{2.3}$$

hold.

Proof. Since (A1) shows that $(x, v) \mapsto pv - H(x, p)$ is continuous for each $p \in \mathbf{R}_+$, we see that the supremum L is lower semicontinuous. We also see that $v \mapsto L(x, v)$ is convex and nondecreasing since $v \mapsto pv - H(x, p)$ is affine and nondecreasing for each $(x, p) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+$.

Show the equation (2.3). First we easily see that

$$L(x, |v|) = \sup_{p \in \mathbf{R}} (pv - H(x, |p|))$$

and hence

$$H(x,|p|) \geq pv - L(x,|v|) \tag{2.4}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $p, v \in \mathbf{R}$. Therefore, it suffices to show that the equality of (2.4) holds for some $v \in \mathbf{R}$. Note that $p \mapsto H(x,|p|)$ is convex in $\mathbf{R}$ by (A2). Thus, for each $p \in \mathbf{R}$ there exists $v \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$H(x,|q|) \geq v(q-p) + H(x,|p|) \quad \text{for all } q \in \mathbf{R},$$

which implies

$$pv - H(x,|p|) \geq \sup_{q \in \mathbf{R}} (vq - H(x,|q|)) = L(x,|v|).$$

We hence have (2.3). The equation (2.2) follows from (2.3). □

We will also assume:

(A3) $c_H(p) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} H(x,p) < \infty$ for each $p \in \mathbf{R}_+$.

(A4) $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} H(x,0) > -\infty$ and

$$\liminf_{p \to \infty} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{H(x,p)}{p} > 0.$$

(A5) L is continuous on $D_L := \{(x,v) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+ \mid L(x,v) < \infty\}$. A map $x \mapsto V_L(x) := \sup\{v \in \mathbf{R}_+ \mid (x,v) \in D_L\}$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathcal{X}$.

Remark 2.2. The condition (A3) implies that

(A3)' $L(x,v) \geq -c_H(0) > -\infty$ for all $(x,v) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}_+$ and $\ell(v) := \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} L(x,v)$ satisfies

$$\liminf_{v \to \infty} \frac{\ell(v)}{v} = \infty. \tag{2.5}$$

Indeed, by definition we have

$$L(x,v) \geq pv - H(x,p) \geq pv - c_H(p) \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathbf{R}_+,$$

which shows $L(x,v) \geq -c_H(0)$ and $\liminf_{v \to \infty} \ell(v)/v \geq p$.

We also see that the condition (A4) implies that

(A4)' there exists $V_L > 0$ such that $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} L(x, V_L) < \infty$

if (A2) holds. Indeed, note that there exist $V > 0$ and $P \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that $H(x,p) \geq pV$ for all $(x,p) \in \mathcal{X} \times [P, \infty)$ and that $H(x,p) \geq H(x,0) \geq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} H(x,0) =: C$. Hence, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} L(x,v) &= \max\{\sup_{p \leq P}(pv - H(x,p)), \sup_{p \geq P}(pv - H(x,p))\} \\ &\leq \max\{(Pv - C), \sup_{p \leq P} p(v - V)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and so $L(x,V) \leq PV - C < \infty$.

We point out that the assumptions (A3) and (A4) can be replaced by (A3)' and (A4)' since we need only (A3)' and (A4)' on the main part of this paper.

Example 2.3. Consider the Hamiltonian of the form

$$H(x,p) = \sigma(x)h(p) - f(x),$$

where h is a continuous, convex, nondecreasing, nonconstant function on $\mathbf{R}_+$; σ and f are bounded continuous functions on $\mathcal{X}$ with $\inf_x \sigma > 0$. Then the conditions (A1)–(A5) are fulfilled. The Lagrangian L becomes

$$L(x,v) = \sigma(x)l\left(\frac{v}{\sigma(x)}\right) + f(x)$$

with $l(v) = \sup_{p\in\mathbf{R}_+}(pv - h(p))$. Typical examples of such h and l include

$$h(p) = \frac{1}{2}p^2, \quad l(v) = \frac{1}{2}v^2,$$

and

$$h(p) = p, \quad l(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v \le 1, \\ \infty & \text{if } v > 1. \end{cases}$$

We introduce a class of trajectories.

Definition 2.4. Let $AC(I,\mathcal{X})$ denote the set of all absolutely continuous curves in $\mathcal{X}$ defined on a interval I of $\mathbf{R}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of all *admissible* curves $\xi \in AC([0,\infty),\mathcal{X})$ such that the metric derivative $|\xi'|$ is piecewise constant and $L[\xi]$ is piecewise continuous; $|\xi'|$ equals a constant v_I and $r \mapsto L(\xi(r), v_I)$ is continuous on each $I = [0,r_1],[r_1,r_2],\cdots,[r_n,\infty)$ with finitely many $r_1,\cdots,r_n$. Let $\mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X}) = \{\xi \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{X}) \mid \xi(0) = x\}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Remark 2.5.

1. Consider a constant curve $\xi(r) = x$ for a fixed point $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $|\xi'| = 0$, we see that $\mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ is nonempty for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.
2. For each $\xi \in AC(\mathbf{R},\mathcal{X})$ with $\xi(0) = x$ take $\hat{\xi} \in AC((L^-,L^+),\mathcal{X})$ in the next proposition. Set $\tilde{\xi}(r) = \hat{\xi}(V_L r)$ for $0 \le r \le L^+/V_L$ and $\tilde{\xi}(r) = \hat{\xi}(L_+)$ for $r \ge L^+/V_L$ with $V_L > 0$ in (A4)'. Then, since $|\hat{\xi}'| = V_L$ a.e. on $[0, L^+/V_L)$, (A4)' and (A5) imply $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$.

Proposition 2.6. *For $\xi \in AC(\mathbf{R},\mathcal{X})$ set*

$$\tau_\xi(h) = \int_0^h |\xi'|dr \quad \textit{for } h \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{2.6}$$

Then, there exists a curve $\hat{\xi} \in AC((L^-,L^+),\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\xi = \hat{\xi} \circ \tau_\xi, \quad |\hat{\xi}'| = 1 \text{ a.e. in } (L^-,L^+) \tag{2.7}$$

with $L^\pm := \lim_{h\to\pm\infty}\tau_\xi(h)$.

This is a well-known fact on the absolutely continuous curves. We refer the reader to [2, Lemma 1.1.4] for its proof.

In order to define a notion of a solution, we recall a notion of a superdifferential and a subdifferential in the viscosity sense. For a continuous function w defined on an open set W in $\mathbf{R}^N$ define the *superdifferential* $D^+w(x)$ and the *subdifferential* $D^-w(x)$ at $x \in W$ as below:

$$D^+w(x) := \{D\varphi(x) \mid \varphi \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ supertangent of } w \text{ at } x\},$$
$$D^-w(x) := \{D\varphi(x) \mid \varphi \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ subtangent of } w \text{ at } x\},$$

where we say that φ is a C^1 *supertangent* (resp. *subtangent*) of w at x if there exists a neighborhood $U \subset W$ of x such that $\varphi \in C^1(U)$ and

$$\max_U(w-\varphi) = (w-\varphi)(x). \quad (\text{resp. } \min_U(w-\varphi) = (w-\varphi)(x).)$$

As an analogue we define a suitable set of a superdifferential and a subdifferential for a piecewise continuous function w defined on an interval I in $\mathbf{R}$ at $h \in I$: Set

$$D^{+,r}w(h) := \{\varphi'(h+0) \mid \varphi \text{ is a piecewise } C^1 \text{ right supertangent of } w \text{ at } h\},$$
$$D^{-,r}w(h) := \{\varphi'(h+0) \mid \varphi \text{ is a piecewise } C^1 \text{ right subtangent of } w \text{ at } h\},$$

where we say that φ is a *piecewise* C^1 *right supertangent* (resp. *subtangent*) of w at h if there exists $r > 0$ such that φ is piecewise C^1 on $[h, h+r)$ and

$$\max_{[h,h+r)}(w-\varphi) = (w-\varphi)(h). \quad (\text{resp. } \min_{[h,h+r)}(w-\varphi) = (w-\varphi)(h).)$$

We define a notion of a subsolution and a supersolution of the equation (2.1). Let $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{X} \times (0,T)$.

Definition 2.7. Let u be an arcwise continuous function in $\mathcal{Q}$; for every $\xi \in AC(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{X})$ the function $w(s,t) = u(\xi(s),t)$ is continuous in $\mathbf{R} \times (0,T)$.

We call u a *subsolution* of (2.1) if for each $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and every $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ the inequality

$$-p \le L(\xi(h), |\xi'|(h+0)) \tag{2.8}$$

holds for all $p \in D^{+,r}w(h)$ and all $h \in [0,t)$.

We call u a *supersolution* of (2.1) if for each $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ and a continuous function w such that

$$w(0) = u(x,t), \quad w(h) \ge u(\xi(h), t-h) - \varepsilon \tag{2.9}$$

and the inequality

$$-p \ge L(\xi(h), |\xi'|(h+0)) \tag{2.10}$$

holds for all $p \in D^{-,r}w(h)$ and all $h \in [0,t)$.

3 Remarks on the solution

The definition of a subsolution and a supersolution is based on a sub- and superoptimality principle. For simplicity write

$$L[\xi](r) := L(\xi(r), |\xi'|(r)).$$

The following propositions are valid:

Proposition 3.1. *For an arcwise continuous function u on $\mathcal{Q}$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) u is a subsolution of (2.1).

(ii) u satisfies a suboptimality: For each $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and each $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ the inequality

$$u(x,t) \le \int_0^h L[\xi]\,dr + u(\xi(h), t-h) \quad \text{for all } h \in [0,t) \tag{3.1}$$

holds.

Proposition 3.2. *For an arcwise continuous function u on $\mathcal{Q}$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) u is a supersolution of (2.1).

(ii) u satisfies a superoptimality: For each $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ such that the inequality

$$u(x,t) \ge \int_0^h L[\xi]\,dr + u(\xi(h), t-h) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } h \in [0,t) \tag{3.2}$$

holds.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. First show (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Fix $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ and a piecewise C^1 right subtangent of $w(h) := u(\xi(h), t-h)$ at $h \in [0,h)$. Note that by considering $\tilde{\xi}(r) = \xi(r+h)$ in the suboptimality we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(h) = u(\xi(h), t-h) &\le \int_0^\theta L[\tilde{\xi}]\,dr + u(\tilde{\xi}(\theta), t-h-\theta) \\ &= \int_h^{h+\theta} L[\xi]\,dr + w(h+\theta) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in [0, t-h)$. We hence obtain

$$\varphi(h) - \varphi(h+\theta) \le w(h) - w(h+\theta) \le \int_h^{h+\theta} L[\xi]\,dr,$$

which implies (2.8) with $p = \varphi(h+0)$ since $L[\xi]$ is piecewise continuous.

Next show (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Fix $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$, and let with $w(h) := u(\xi(h), t-h)$. Note that $\int_0^h L[\xi]dr$ is piecewise C^1 on $[0,t)$ since $L[\xi]$ is piecewise continuous. Therefore,

$$\ell(h) := w(h) + \int_0^h L[\xi]dr$$

satisfies $p \geq 0$ for all $p \in D^{+,r}\ell(h)$ and all $h \in [0,t)$ since (2.8) holds for all

$$p \in D^{+,r}w(h) = D^{+,r}\ell(h) - L(\xi(h), |\xi'|(h+0))$$

We now claim that $\ell(0) \leq \ell(h)$ for each $h \in [0,t)$. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\ell(0) > \ell(h)$ at some $h \in (0,t)$. Since $\ell(0) > \ell(0) - c > \ell(h)$ holds for some positive number c, the function

$$\ell(r) + \frac{c}{h}r$$

attains a maximum over $[0,h]$ at some $r^* \in [0,h)$. Hence, we have $-c \geq 0$, which contradicts to $c > 0$. Therefore, we see that $\ell(0) \leq \ell(h)$ and so (3.1) holds for all $h \in [0,t)$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. First show (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). For $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ take $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ such that (3.2) holds. Set

$$w(h) := u(x,t) - \int_0^h L[\xi]dr.$$

so that (2.9) holds. Since $L[\xi]$ is piecewise continuous, w is piecewise C^1 and

$$w'(h+0) = -L(\xi(h), |\xi'|(h+0)) \quad \text{for all } h \in [0,t),$$

which shows that u is a supersolution. Indeed, for each piecewise C^1 right subtangent φ of w at some $h \in [0,t)$, we see that

$$\varphi(h) - \varphi(h+\theta) \geq w(h) - w(h+\theta) = \int_h^{h+\theta} L[\xi]dr$$

for all $\theta > 0$ small enough, which implies (2.10) with $p = \varphi(h+0)$.

Next show (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). For each $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ take $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ and a continuous function w such that (2.9) and (2.10) hold. Note that $\int_0^h L[\xi]dr$ is piecewise C^1 on $[0,t)$ since $L[\xi]$ is piecewise continuous. Therefore,

$$\ell(h) := w(h) + \int_0^h L[\xi]dr$$

satisfies $p \leq 0$ for all $p \in D^{-,r}\ell(h)$ and all $h \in [0,t)$ since (2.10) holds for all

$$p \in D^{-,r}w(h) = D^{-,r}\ell(h) - L(\xi(h), |\xi'|(h+0))$$

We now claim that $\ell(0) \geq \ell(h)$ for each $h \in [0,t)$. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\ell(0) < \ell(h)$ at some $h \in (0,t)$. Since $\ell(0) < \ell(0) + c < \ell(h)$ holds for some positive number c, the function

$$\ell(r) - \frac{c}{h} r$$

attains a minimum over $[0,h]$ at some $r^* \in [0,h)$. Hence, we have $c \leq 0$, which contradicts $c > 0$. Therefore, we have $\ell(0) \geq \ell(h)$ so that

$$w(0) \geq w(h) + \int_0^h L[\xi]\, dr,$$

which yields (3.2) by (2.9) for all $h \in [0,t)$. □

Next let us consider relationship between a solution by Definition 2.7 and another one based on the characterization of the modulus of gradient (1.2). Set

$$LC^1_x(\mathcal{X}) = \{\xi \in AC([0,\infty), \mathcal{X}) \mid |\xi'| \leq 1,\ \xi(0) = x,\ |\xi'| \text{ is piecewise constant}\}.$$

Definition 3.3 (Metric viscosity solution)**.** Let u be an arcwise continuous function on $\mathcal{Q}$.

We call u a *metric viscosity subsolution* of (2.1) if for each $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and every $\xi \in LC^1_x(\mathcal{X})$ the inequality

$$q + H(x, |p|) \leq 0 \tag{3.3}$$

holds for all $(p,q) \in D^+_{s,t} w(0,t)$ with $w(s,t) = u(\xi(s), t)$, where

$$D^+_{s,t} w(s,t) := \{(\varphi_s, \varphi_t)(s,t) \mid \varphi \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ supertangent of } w \text{ at } (s,t)\}.$$

We then have

Proposition 3.4. *Assume (A1)–(A5) and let u be an arcwise continuous function on $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) u is a subsolution of (2.1)*.*

(ii) u is a metric viscosity subsolution of (2.1)*.*

(iii) u satisfies a suboptimality.

Proof. The statement (i) ⇔ (iii) has already shown in Proposition 3.2.

Show (iii) ⇒ (ii). Fix $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\xi \in LC^1_x(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{X})$ and a C^1 supertangent φ of $w(s,t) = u(\xi(s), t)$ at $(0,t)$. In order to prove (3.3) we should show

$$q + |p| v - L(x,v) \leq 0 \tag{3.4}$$

for all $v \in \mathbf{R}_+$. Note that (3.4) is trivial for $v > V_L(x)$, i.e. $L(x,v) = \infty$ and we only need to show (3.4) for all $v < V_L(x)$ since letting $v \to V_L(x)$ yields (3.4) at $v = V_L(x)$. Take $\sigma(r) = \pm vr$ so that $\xi \circ \sigma$ is v-Lipschitz. We now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(0,t) - \varphi(\sigma(h), t-h) &\le u(x,t) - u(\xi(\sigma(h)), t-h)\\ &\le \int_0^h L[\xi \circ \sigma]\,dr\\ &\le \int_0^h L(\xi(\sigma(r)), v)\,dr\end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in [0,t)$ small enough. Since $v < V_L(x)$ it follows from (A5) that $r \in [0,t) \mapsto L(\xi(\sigma(r)), v)$ is continuous at 0. Therefore, we have

$$-p\sigma'(0) + q \le L(x,v)$$

which yields (3.4) and so (3.3) holds.

Next show (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). First note that for any $\hat{\xi} \in LC^1_x(\mathcal{X})$ the function $w(s,t) = u(\hat{\xi}(s), t)$ satisfies

$$q + H(\xi(s), |p|) = \sup_{v \in \mathbf{R}} \{q + pv - L(\xi(s), |v|)\} \le 0 \tag{3.5}$$

for all $(p,q) \in D^+_{s,t} w(s,t)$ and all $(s,t) \in \mathbf{R} \times (0,T)$. Fix $(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_{\hat{x}}(\mathcal{X})$. Take $\hat{\xi} \in LC^1_x(\mathcal{X})$ and $\tau = \tau_\xi$ satisfying (2.6), (2.7). We show that

$$w(0,\hat{t}) \le w(\tau(h), \hat{t} - h) + \int_0^h L(\hat{\xi}(\tau(r)), \tau'(r))\,dr \quad \text{for all } h \in [0, \hat{t}) \tag{3.6}$$

Note that τ' is piecewise constant and $L[\xi \circ \tau]$ is piecewise continuous. Let us take an interval $I = (a,b)$ with $[a,b] \subset [0,\hat{t})$ on which τ' is constant $v \in \mathbf{R}_+$ and $r \mapsto L(\hat{\xi}(\tau(r)), v)$ is continuous. By (3.5)

$$q - pv - L(\hat{\xi}(s), v) \le 0 \quad \text{for all } (p,q) \in D^+_{s,t} w(s,t),\ (s,t) \in J \times (0,T),$$

where $J = \tau(I)$ if $v > 0$ or $J = \mathbf{R}$ if $v = 0$. By a classical result on viscosity solutions,

$$w(s,t) \le w(\lambda(h)) + \int_0^h L(\hat{\xi}(s + vr), v)\,dr$$

for all $(s,t) \in J \times (0,T)$ and $0 \le h < h^* := \sup\{h \in [0,\infty) \mid \lambda(h) \in J \times (0,T)\}$ with $\lambda(h) = (s + vh, t - h)$. Note that $h^* \ge (b-a) \wedge t$. Letting $s \to \tau(a)$, $t = \hat{t} - a$, $h \to (b-a) \wedge t = b - a$, we have

$$w(\tau(a), \hat{t} - a) \le w(\tau(b), \hat{t} - b) + \int_a^b L(\hat{\xi}(\tau(r)), v)\,dr.$$

Combining such an inequality shows (3.6), which implies (3.1). □

4 Unique existence theorem

We study the initial value problem of (2.1) with

$$u|_{t=0} = u_0 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{X}, \tag{4.1}$$

where we assume that

(A6) u_0 is bounded and uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{X}$; there exists a modulus ω_{u_0} such that

$$|u_0(x) - u_0(y)| \le \omega_{u_0}(d(x,y)) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Here, a modulus ω is a function of the class $C(\mathbf{R}_+, \mathbf{R}_+)$ with $\omega(0) = 0$.

The main purpose of this section is to establish a unique existence theorem for (2.1) and (4.1).

Definition 4.1. An arcwise continuous function u on $\mathcal{X} \times [0,T)$ is called a *solution* of the initial value problem (2.1) and (4.1) if u is both a subsolution and a supersolution of (2.1), and satisfies

$$u(0,x) = u_0(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}. \tag{4.2}$$

Consider the *cost functional* to the initial value problem (2.1) and (4.1);

$$C_t[\xi] := \int_0^t L[\xi]\,dr + u_0(\xi(t))$$

for $t \in [0,T]$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$. Define the *value function* U by

$$U(x,t) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})} C_t[\xi] \quad \text{for } (x,t) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0,T].$$

We will show that the value function is a unique solution of (2.1) and (4.1).

Theorem 4.2. *Assume (A1)–(A6). Then the value function U is a unique solution of* (2.1) *and* (4.1).

We first show a regularity of the value function.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume (A1)–(A6). Then the value function U satisfies*

$$-c_H(0)t + \inf u_0 \le U(x,t) \le tL(x,0) + u_0(x) \quad \textit{for all } (x,t) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0,T]. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Let $(x,t) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0,T]$. Since $\xi_0(r) = x$ is of $\mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$, we have

$$C_t[\xi_0] = tL(x,0) + u_0(x) < \infty.$$

For each $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$, the assumptions imply that

$$C_t[\xi] = \int_0^t L[\xi]\,dr + u_0(\xi(h)) \ge -c_H(0)t + \inf u_0 > -\infty.$$

Therefore, we have (4.3). □

Proposition 4.4. *Assume (A1)–(A6). Then the value function U is bounded and arcwise uniformly continuous on $\mathcal{X} \times [0,T]$, i.e. for each $\xi \in Lip^1(\mathcal{X})$ the function $w(s,t) = u(\xi(s),t)$ is uniformly continuous in $\mathbf{R} \times [0,T]$.*

Proof. First note that (4.3) implies

$$-|c_H(0)|T + \inf u_0 \le U(x,t) \le T|\sup L(x,0)| + \sup u_0. \tag{4.4}$$

In particular, U is a bounded function.

Fix $\xi \in AC(\mathcal{X})$. In order to show continuity of $(s,t) \mapsto U(\xi(s),t)$ let us estimate $U(\xi(s),t) - U(\xi(\bar{s}),\bar{t})$ for $s,\bar{s} \in \mathbf{R}$, $t,\bar{t} \in [0,T]$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By the definition of $U(\xi(\bar{s}),\bar{t})$ there exists a curve $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$U(\xi(\bar{s}),\bar{t}) \ge \int_0^{\bar{t}} L[\bar{\xi}]dr + u_0(\bar{\xi}(\bar{t})) - \varepsilon. \tag{4.5}$$

We now construct a curve $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\tilde{\xi}(r) = \bar{\xi}(r - r_0) \quad \text{for } r \ge r_0$$

with some $r_0 \ge 0$. Note that for such a curve

$$\begin{aligned} U(\xi(s),t) &\le \int_0^t L[\tilde{\xi}]dr + u_0(\tilde{\xi}(t)) \\ &= \int_0^{r_0} L[\tilde{\xi}]dr + \int_0^{t-r_0} L[\bar{\xi}]dr + u_0(\bar{\xi}(t-r_0)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Set

$$\tilde{\xi}(r) = \begin{cases} \hat{\xi}(\tau(s) + V_L \frac{\tau(\bar{s})-\tau(s)}{|\tau(\bar{s})-\tau(s)|} r) & \text{for } 0 \le r \le |\tau(\bar{s}) - \tau(s)|/V_L =: r_1 \\ \xi(\bar{s}) & \text{for } r_1 \le r \le r_1 + |\bar{t} - t| =: r_0 \end{cases}$$

with $\hat{\xi}$ and $\tau = \tau_\xi$ taken by Proposition 2.6. Then, noting that $|\tilde{\xi}'| = 0$ on $[0,r_1]$ and $|\tilde{\xi}'| = V_L$ on $[r_1,r_0]$, we have

$$R_1 := \int_0^{r_0} L[\tilde{\xi}]dr \le \int_0^{r_0} L(\tilde{\xi}(r),V_L)dr \le r_0 \sup_x L(x,V_L) \tag{4.7}$$

The inequalities (4.5)–(4.7) yields

$$U(\xi(s),t) - U(\xi(\bar{s}),\bar{t}) \le R_1 - R_2 + R_3 + \varepsilon, \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$R_2 := \int_{t-r_0}^{\bar{t}} L[\bar{\xi}]dr, \quad R_3 := u_0(\bar{\xi}(t-r_0)) - u_0(\bar{\xi}(\bar{t})).$$

Now noting that

$$t - r_0 = t - |\tau(\bar{s}) - \tau(s)|/V_L - |\bar{t} - t| \le \bar{t},$$

we hence see that

$$R_2 \geq -c_H(\bar{t} - t + r_0). \tag{4.9}$$

We also have

$$R_3 \leq \omega_{u_0}\left(\int_{t-r_0}^{\bar{t}} |\bar{\xi}'|dr\right). \tag{4.10}$$

holds in any cases. Combining (4.7)–(4.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} U(\xi(s),t) - U(\xi(\bar{s}),\bar{t}) \leq & r_0 \sup_x L(x,V_L) + c_H(0)(\bar{t} - t + r_0) \\ & + \omega_{u_0}\left(\int_{t-r_0}^{\bar{t}} |\bar{\xi}'|dr\right) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$r_1 = |\tau(\bar{s}) - \tau(s)|/V_L = \frac{1}{V_L}\left|\int_s^{\bar{s}} |\xi'|dr\right| \leq \frac{|\bar{s} - s|}{V_L} \to 0$$

as $|\bar{s} - s| \to 0$. Therefore, if we show

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{|\bar{s}-s|+|\bar{t}-t| \leq \delta} \int_{t-r_0}^{\bar{t}} |\bar{\xi}'|dr = 0, \tag{4.11}$$

the proof is completed.

By (4.4) and (4.8) we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t-r_0}^{\bar{t}} L(\bar{\xi}(r), |\bar{\xi}'|(r))dr \\ &\quad \leq r_0 \sup_x L(x,V_L) + R_3 + \varepsilon - U(\xi(s),t) + U(\xi(\bar{s}),\bar{t}) \\ &\quad \leq 4\sup|g| + 1 + (\mathrm{Lip}[\xi]/V_L + 1)|\sup_x L(x,V_L)| + T|\sup_x L(x,0)| + |c_H(0)|T, \end{aligned}$$

for $\varepsilon < 1$, $|\bar{s} - s| + |\bar{t} - t| < 1$ and hence

$$\int_{t-r_0}^{\bar{t}} \ell(|\bar{\xi}'|)dr \leq C < \infty$$

holds with some constant C independent of $\bar{s}, s, \bar{t}, t$. Therefore, the next lemma shows (4.11). □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\{v_n\}$ be a sequence of nonnegative, Lebesgue measurable functions v_n defined on $[0, s_n]$ with $s_n \downarrow 0$ such that*

$$\int_0^{s_n} \ell(v_n(r))dr \leq C \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbf{N}$$

holds for some constant C. Then,

$$\int_0^{s_n} v_n(r)dr \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Proof. Note that (2.5) implies that for every large $M > 0$ there exists $V_M \geq 0$ such that $\ell(v) \geq Mv$ holds for all $v \leq V_M$. We now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{s_n} \ell(v_n(r))dr &= \int_{[0,s_n]\cap\{v_n \geq V_M\}} \ell(v_n(r))dr + \int_{[0,s_n]\cap\{v_n < V_M\}} \ell(v_n(r))dr \\ &\geq M \int_{[0,s_n]\cap\{v_n \geq V_M\}} v_n(r)dr - c_H(0)s_n.\end{aligned}$$

We also see by this that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{s_n} v_n(r)dr &= \int_{[0,s_n]\cap\{v_n \geq V_M\}} v_n(r)dr + \int_{[0,s_n]\cap\{v_n < V_M\}} v_n(r)dr \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M}\int_{[0,s_n]\cap\{v_n \geq V_M\}} \ell(v_n(r))dr + \frac{C_H}{M}s_n + V_M s_n \\ &\leq \frac{C}{M} + \frac{C_H}{M}s_n + V_M s_n.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_0^{s_n} v_n(r)dr \leq \frac{C}{M}$$

for all $M > 0$, and so letting $M \to \infty$ implies the conclusion. □

Theorem 4.6. *Assume (A1)–(A6). Then the value function U is a solution of* (2.1), (4.1).

Proof. First show that U is a subsolution. Fix $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$. Since there exists $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ for $h \in [0,t]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$U(\xi(h), t-h) \geq \int_0^{t-h} L[\bar{\xi}]dr + u_0(\bar{\xi}(t-h)) - \varepsilon,$$

taking $\tilde{\xi}(r) = \xi(r)$ for $0 \leq r \leq h$, $\tilde{\xi}(r) = \bar{\xi}(r-h)$ for $r \geq h$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}U(x,t) &\leq \int_0^t L[\tilde{\xi}]dr + u_0(\tilde{\xi}(t)) \\ &= \int_0^h L[\xi]dr + \int_0^{t-h} L[\bar{\xi}]dr + u_0(\bar{\xi}(t-h)).\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two inequalities yields

$$U(x,t) \leq \int_0^h L[\xi]dr + U(\xi(h), t-h) + \varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, U satisfies a suboptimality and hence U is a subsolution by Proposition 3.1.

To prove that U is a supersolution, for $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ take $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$U(x,t) \geq \int_0^t L[\xi]dr + u_0(\xi(t)) - \varepsilon.$$

Since $\tilde{\xi}(r) = \xi(r+h)$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ for $h \in [0,t]$, we have

$$U(\xi(h), t-h) \le \int_h^t L[\xi]\,dr + u_0(\xi(t)).$$

Combining these two inequalities yields

$$U(x,t) \ge \int_0^h L[\xi]\,dr + U(\xi(h), t-h) - \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, U satisfies a superoptimality and hence U is a supersolution by Proposition 3.2.

Since it is clear that U satisfies (4.2) by definition, we see that U is a solution. □

Remark 4.7. This proof also shows that a dynamic programming principle is valid for the value function:

$$U(x,t) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})} \left\{ \int_0^h L[\xi]\,dr + U(\xi(h), t-h) \right\} \quad \text{for all } h \in [0,t].$$

This condition also indicates that the value function satisfies a semigroup property.

We show a comparison theorem.

Theorem 4.8. *Assume (A1)–(A6). Assume that arcwise continuous functions u and v on $\mathcal{X} \times [0,T)$ are a subsolution and a supersolution, respectively. Then, the inequality*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q}}(u - v) \le \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}}(u(x,0) - v(x,0)) \tag{4.12}$$

holds.

Proof. Fix $(x,t) \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{A}_x(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$v(x,t) \ge \int_0^h L[\xi]\,dr + v(\xi(h)) - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } h \in [0,t].$$

Note that $L[\xi]$ is piecewise continuous on $[0,t]$. Since $(s,t) \mapsto v(\xi(s),t)$ is continuous on $[0,t] \times [0,T)$ by the arcwise continuity of v, letting $h \to t$ we have

$$v(x,t) \ge \int_0^t L[\xi]\,dr + v(\xi(t), 0) - \varepsilon$$

We also see that

$$u(x,t) \le \int_0^h L[\xi]\,dr + u(\xi(h), t-h) \quad \text{for all } h \in [0,t),$$

which implies

$$u(x,t) \le \int_0^t L[\xi]dr + u(\xi(t),0).$$

Combining the inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,t) - v(x,t) &\le u(\xi(t),0) - v(\xi(t),0) + \varepsilon \\ &\le \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}}(u(x,0) - v(x,0)) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 4.6 imply that the value function U is a solution. If u is another solution, Theorem 4.8 implies that $u \le U$ and $U \le u$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ since $u|_{t=0} = U|_{t=0} = u_0$, and hence we see that $u = U$. □

Acknowledgments

The author thank Yoshikazu Giga for his constructive comments and continuous encouragement. The work of the author was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows No. 25-7077 and the Program for Leading Graduate Schools, MEXT, Japan.

References

[1] L. Ambrosio and J. Feng, *On a class of first order HamiltonJacobi equations in metric spaces*, J. Differential Equations **256** (2014), no. 7, 2194-2245.

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*, second ed., Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2008.

[3] M. Bardi and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta, *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1997.

[4] M. G. Crandall and P.-L. Lions, *Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **277** (1983), no. 1, 1–42.

[5] ———, *Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions. I. Uniqueness of viscosity solutions*, J. Funct. Anal. **62** (1985), no. 3, 379–396.

[6] ———, *Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions. II. Existence of viscosity solutions*, J. Funct. Anal. **65** (1986), no. 3, 368–405.

[7] ———, *Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions, III*, J. Funct. Anal. **68** (1986), no. 2, 214–247.

[8] ———, *Viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in infinite dimensions. IV. Hamiltonians with unbounded linear terms*, J. Funct. Anal. **90** (1990), no. 2, 237–283.

[9] J. Feng and M. Katsoulakis, *A comparison principle for Hamilton-Jacobi equations related to controlled gradient flows in infinite dimensions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **192** (2009), no. 2, 275–310.

[10] W. Gangbo, T. Nguyen, and A. Tudorascu, *Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the Wasserstein space*, Methods Appl. Anal. **15** (2008), no. 2, 155–183.

[11] W. Gangbo and A. Swiech, *Optimal Transport and Large Number of Particles*, Discret. Cont. Dynam. Syst., to appear.

[12] W. Gangbo and A. Swiech, *Metric Viscosity Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations*, preprint.

[13] Y. Giga, N. Hamamuki, and A. Nakayasu, *Eikonal equations in metric spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear, available at http://eprints3.math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp/2172/.

[14] C. Imbert and R. Monneau, *The vertex test function for Hamilton-Jacobi equations on networks*, preprint.

[15] C. Imbert, R. Monneau, and H. Zidani, *A Hamilton-Jacobi approach to junction problems and application to traffic flows*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **19** (2013), no. 1, 129-166.

[16] M. J. Lighthill and G. B. Whitham, *On kinematic waves. II. A theory of traffic flow on long crowded roads*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London. Ser. A. **229** (1955), 317–345.

[17] P.-L. Lions, *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass., 1982.

[18] P. I. Richards, *Shock waves on the highway*, Operations Res. **4** (1956), 42–51.

[19] C. Villani, *Optimal transport*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.